



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,043	02/06/2002	Curtis R. Priem	P000449/1308C	4191

7590 08/25/2003
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/072,043

Applicant(s)

PRIEM, CURTIS R.

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) Applicant argues in essence that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "a graphics controller coupled to the memory, the graphics controller accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller comprising memory for holding information read from the font array" as recited in independent Claim 1. In response, the examiner asserts that Lobodzinski teaches the claimed limitation of "a graphics controller coupled to the memory, the graphics controller accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller comprising memory for holding information read from the font array". The examiner urges applicant to review the FINAL rejection set forth in the previous Office Action, especially the REMARKS section of the FINAL rejection because this issue has been extensively addressed in the previous Office Action.

In the last Office Action, the examiner has demonstrated that Lobodzinski meets the claim limitations set forth in the claims. Namely, Lobodzinski fulfills the claim 1 as currently amended IF the examiner interprets the graphics controller of the claimed invention as the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski (see figure 2).

In column 2, lines 35-67, column 3, lines 1-33, column 4, lines 1-33, column 5, lines 34-65, Lobodzinski clearly teaches a graphics engine 48 of figure 2 coupled to the memory (i.e., a separate memory similar to frame buffer 56, column 3, lines 4-5), the graphics controller (i.e., the graphics engine 48) accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller (i.e., the graphics engine 48) comprising memory (registers within the text engine, figure 2, TABLE I, column 4, lines 30-33, column 5, lines 33-49) for holding information read from the font array (i.e., the font array in Character font information 62 of figure 3A and 4A).

Moreover, the examiner notes that elements of the graphics controller shown in discrete components in the reference can be combined in a variety of fashions and should be still within the scope of Lobodzinski's invention, e.g., the register file 46 and the frame buffer 56 could be integrated with the graphics engine 48 and can be included in the graphics engine 48 (column 3, lines 4-5).

As applied to the present application, Lobodzinski fulfills claim 1 as currently amended.

On the other hand, Lobodzinski fulfills the claim 1 as currently amended IF the examiner interprets the graphics controller of the claimed invention as the display controller 30 of Lobodzinski (see figures 1 and 2).

A memory (a separate memory of column 3, lines 4-5 similar to the frame buffer 56 of figure 2, column 2, lines 58-67, column 3, lines 1-10) having stored therein a data structure (figures 3-7, column 3, lines 11-33, column 4, lines 1-4), the data structure including at least one font array (e.g., font 1 of reference sign 62a and font 2 of reference sign 62b of figure 3 in the reference); and

A graphics controller (i.e. the display controller 30 of figure 1. The detailed description of the display controller 30 is shown in figure 2 of the reference) coupled to the memory (i.e., a separate memory similar to frame buffer 56, column 3, lines 4-5), the graphics controller (i.e., the display controller 30) accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller (i.e., the display controller 30) comprising memory (Frame Buffer 56) for holding information read from the font array (i.e., Frame Buffer 56 of figure 2 holding information read from the font array in Character font information 62 of figure 3A and 4A).

As applied to the present application, Lobodzinski AGAIN fulfills claim 1 as currently amended.

2) Applicant argues in essence that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "placing the information read from the font array in memory resident on a graphics controller. In response, the examiner asserts that Lobodzinski teaches the claimed limitation of "placing the information read from the font array in memory resident on a graphics controller.

The examiner interprets the font array as the array of Index 412, Font Pointer 414, Font Pitch 415, X 416, Y 418, Size Width 420, Size Height 421. However, this array is resident on the graphics engine 48 of figure 2 (See TABLE I, column 4, lines 30-33, column 5, lines 33-49 of Lobodzinski).

As applied to the present application, Lobodzinski fulfills claim 26 as currently amended.

3) Applicant argues in essence that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest a system "wherein glyph information for a character to be rendered, said size width information and said size height information are read to registers of said graphics controller from said data structure" as recited in independent claim 48. In response, the examiner asserts that Lobodzinski teaches the claimed limitation of "wherein glyph information for a character to be rendered, said size width information and said size height information are read to registers of said graphics controller from said data structure" (See for example table 1; column 5, lines 33-65; column 6, lines 60-65).

4) Applicant argues in essence that there is no showing or suggestion in Lobodzinski that graphics engine 48 places information read from character font information 62 into memory resident on the graphics engine 48 and Lobodzinski only describes registers 46 that are not resident on the graphics engine. In response, the examiner disagrees with applicant's allegation in relation with Lobodzinski's reference. In column 2, lines 35-67, column 3, lines 1-33, column 4, lines 1-33, column 5, lines 34-65, Lobodzinski clearly teaches a graphics engine 48 of figure 2 coupled to the memory (i.e., a separate memory similar to frame buffer 56, column 3, lines 4-5), the graphics controller (i.e., the graphics engine 48) accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller (i.e., the graphics engine 48) comprising memory (registers within the text engine, figure 2, TABLE I, column 4, lines 30-33, column 5, lines 33-49) for holding information read from the font array (i.e., the font array in Character font information 62 of figure 3A and 4A). Note that Lobodzinski clearly teaches in Fig. 2, a BLT ENGINE 50, TEXT ENGINE 52, and OTHER ENGINE 54 including registers associated with the text engine as described in TABLE I for holding information read from the font array.

5) On page 3, lines 8-9, applicant argues in essence that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest memory resident on a graphics controller. In response, the examiner asserts that Lobodzinski clearly teaches memory resident on a graphics controller 30 of figure 2. For example, the character font information 62 and the text string information memory 64 (See figures 1-7).

6) On page 3, third paragraph, applicant argues in essence that from Claims 2, 27 and 49, for example, it can be interpreted that the

memory of the claimed graphics controller is different from a frame buffer. The examiner disagrees with applicant's argument because the graphics controller 30 of Lobodzinski comprising a frame buffer which is a piece of memory by itself and which further comprises the character font information 62 and the text string information memory 64, both of these components are memories. Applicant's argument is moot in view of the graphics controller 30 comprising the character font information 62 and the text string information memory 64 because both of which are CALLED memories.

7) On page 4, second paragraph, applicant disagrees with the examiner's interpretation of the font array. Applicant insists that the font array recited in the claims is specifically a font array of the data structure. However, the array of index 412, font pointer 414, font pitch 415, x 416, y 418, size width 420 and size height 421 is a font array and the illustrated components are concrete example components of the font array of the data structure that has been taught by Lobodzinski.

8) On page 4, third paragraph, applicant concludes that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 26 and 48. In response, the examiner asserts that Lobodzinski teaches the claims as currently drafted in view of the previous Office Action and the response set forth in above.



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600